





## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

	States Patent and Trademark Office
Address:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	unyuy nento gov

				CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,475	05/10/2001	Warren A. Ceroll	0275A000385	6023
27572 759	7590 12/16/2003 EXAMINER			INER
	ICKEY & PIERCE, F	PRONE, JASON D		
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3724	10

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.3	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/852,475	CEROLL ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jason Prone	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	rrespond nce address				
THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	ln			
706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);				
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the	<b>;</b>			
(d)  they present additional claims without cancelli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
-4- Newly-proposed-or-amended-claim(s) would-be-allowable-if-submitted-in-a-separate, timely-filed-amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	CU /					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:	Alian N. Shoap					
· , • ———	Jpervisory Patent Examiner					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	Group 3700					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. ☐ Other:						





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Brunson discloses all the structure disclosed in the claims except that the first position where the detent lever is pivotally attached is spaced from the second position where the locking lever is pivotally attached. The Brault et al. ('624) patent is used to modify the structure, previously disclosed by Brunson, so that the locking and detent lever can move independently only. Therefore, the Brunson and Brault et al. ('624) patents disclose all the structural limitations set forth in the claims. The rejection is valid and will remain.